



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

izing men with different customs and with the idea of social change, and in explaining the nature of historical evolution, so different from the evolution of the animal world. The volume closes with two appendices dealing with the condition of historical studies in French institutions of secondary and higher education.

This summary will serve to show the general plan of the book, although it does not do justice to its originality of thought or its clearness of exposition. The *Introduction* is simpler and more compact than Bernheim's *Lehrbuch*, whose merits the authors acknowledge and to which they frequently refer; it omits the bibliographies, the discussions of metaphysical problems, and the numerous examples which occupy so much space in that excellent manual. On the other hand it supplements Bernheim at several important points, its analysis is often more penetrating, and it devotes a larger share of its attention to the important problems of historical synthesis. Some of the authors' statements demand fuller justification than has here been given, and some of them are sufficiently radical to provoke dissent in many quarters, but the work as a whole is a valuable contribution to the literature of historical method and cannot be read without stimulating thought and clarifying one's ideas. It is to be hoped that the demand for the *Introduction* will be sufficient to encourage M. Seignobos to prepare the elaborate treatise on historical method which he has in contemplation. He has worked out certain phases of the subject more fully in his noteworthy articles, *Les Conditions Psychologiques de la Connaissance en Histoire*, in the *Revue Philosophique*, July and August, 1887.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. By ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT, PH.D., D.D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897. Pp. xiii, 681.)

THIS is the most comprehensive and the most critical work upon the Apostolic Age that has yet proceeded from the American press and an American author, and it is destined to play an important part for some time to come in the discussion of the questions connected with the rise and early history of Christianity. That it will be accepted as a standard history by American scholars and the reading public is hardly to be expected, or desired. The work may be briefly characterized as an attempt to reconstruct the history of the origin and development of Christianity in the Apostolic Age upon the lines laid down by Professor Harnack and the "modified" Ritschl school. Still there are many important things in the book to which, if we are not mistaken, Dr. Harnack will hesitate to subscribe. This is only to say, that Professor McGiffert, while agreeing in the main with Harnack, does not hesitate to diverge from him, and gives abundant evidence of independent research and critical acumen.

In the arrangement of his material Professor McGiffert has adopted

in general the scheme of Weizsaecker. But when it comes to the portrayal of the progress of Christianity his treatment is more comprehensive than that of his illustrious predecessor, while at the same time equal attention is given to the discussion of details. The work opens with a chapter on the origin of Christianity, which is treated under three heads, —Judaism, John the Baptist and Jesus. The first of these is well handled, and displays our author's power of rapid survey and of clear and concise statement. The interpretation of John's character and mission is less successful, and the significance of the Forerunner's work is underestimated. But it is when we come to the section on Jesus that the gravest defects in this entire work are disclosed. It might seem at first unfair to judge a history of apostolic Christianity by the author's treatment of the person of Christ. But since the question of the origin of Christianity and the question of its development cannot now be separated, and since the Founder of the Faith continued, or is generally supposed to have continued, to be its inspiration and impulse, there is no injustice in testing the volume before us by its exposition of the life, character and teaching of Jesus. Professor McGiffert gives some twenty pages to this theme. He begins by referring us (in a foot-note) to "the Lives of Christ and the general works on New Testament theology," adding the related works of Wendt, Baldensperger, Toy, Cone, Briggs and others. But since he does not tell us which "Lives" and which "New Testament theologies," we are left in doubt as to his views on several important points, since he is himself often rather strangely silent. For example, many recent "Lives" seek to maintain the historicity of the birth-stories as given by Matthew and Luke, and to establish the fact of the bodily resurrection of Jesus. Professor McGiffert, so far as we have observed, does not even allude to these birth-stories, presumably because he believes them to be wholly legendary. But if legendary, is it not the function of the historian of apostolic Christianity to trace the growth of the legends, and to explain their adoption by the Church? The question of the bodily resurrection of Jesus is similarly slighted. Our author says that "at a very early day . . . the expectation of a resurrection of the body had become almost universal among Christians" (p. 453). Whence came this belief? Had it any connection with the resurrection of Jesus? These questions are not unimportant and yet they are left unanswered. We are told (p. 19) that Jesus "began with the announcement of the approach of that [kingdom] for which they [the Jews] were all looking, and throughout his ministry it was this kingdom and none other, of which he spoke." But on page 21 we are informed that "in regarding the kingdom as a present reality, Jesus departed in a most decisive way from the conceptions entertained by his countrymen," and (p. 22) that his "conception of the future kingdom was doubtless due in part to Jewish influence, but in still larger part to his own experience." Now which of these statements are we to credit? Dr. McGiffert declares that "it seems never to have occurred to him [Jesus] that the time would yet come for its [the Jewish law's] abrogation" (p. 26). But what are we

to do with Christ's words to the woman by Jacob's well: "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father" (Jno. 4: 21 f.)? Did not that contemplate the abolition of the temple ritual laws? Cf. Mk. 13: 2, Matth. 9: 14 f. and Jno. 10: 11 f. Again, by his conduct and by his words Jesus forecast the transformation of the Jewish laws regarding the Sabbath (Mk. 2: 23 f.), regarding cleanliness (Mk. 7: 1 f.), fasting (Mk. 2: 18 f.), prayer (Matth. 6: 5 f.), almsgiving (Matth. 6: 2 f.). He likewise prepared the way for a change of attitude toward the whole moral law as embodied in the Hebrew Scriptures (Matth. 5: 21 f.). Our author seems to admit as much, but says "Jesus gave no clear indication that he expected it ever to come" (p. 27). Jesus then was not alive to the real significance of his own words, and yet Dr. McGiffert tells us that he "gave utterance to a principle which *must* revolutionize the prevailing conception of the law" (p. 27)! Once more, we are informed (p. 30) that "Jesus' emphasis of faith in, or acceptance of himself, is throughout an emphasis not of his personality but of his message." This, as it seems to us, is a direct inversion of the facts and a complete perversion of the truth. For Jesus had the deep consciousness that he was come *to be* something from God to the World. He brought a message, to be sure, but it was an *incarnated* message, and therein lay its significance and power. Moreover he, the Son of Man and the Son of God, *gave his life* for the redemption of the world. This is his own interpretation of his mission, and his first disciples so understood him and in that faith the foundations of the Church were laid. But Dr. McGiffert tells us that "they thought of him only as the Messiah, and the fact that he left a church behind him, instead of a mere name, and that he is known to history as the founder of a religion and not as a mere sage or prophet, is historically due not so much to any uniqueness either in his character or his nature, as to the conviction which he succeeded in imparting to his followers that he was the one who had been promised by the prophets and long awaited by the fathers;" and "had he not stepped into the place which had for so long been waiting to be filled, and become the centre of the accumulated hopes and expectations of centuries," "he might have been all that he was as a teacher and a wonder-worker, and yet have accomplished little more than John the Baptist did" (p. 32).

Passing now to Chapter II., "Primitive Jewish Christianity," let us inquire of Dr. McGiffert as to what the disciples thought and believed concerning Jesus after he had been taken from them. We are told that "there is no reason to suppose that the disciples in the beginning had any other idea of the Messiah than that which prevailed among their countrymen in general,"—viz. that of "a man called and chosen by God,"—and "there is no sign that they thought of asking whether that idea was correct or not" (p. 54). Now it is fair to assume that the disciples shared in the main their Master's opinions concerning himself and his mission, after they had recovered from the shock of his death and been illumined by the glorious fact of his resurrection. For two years or

more they had been in the closest daily intercourse with him ; he shared with them his inmost thoughts, and sought in every way to make known to them his purpose and mission. It is not conceivable that Jesus, who had such clear insight into character, should have selected twelve men who were so dull as to be impervious to his great central thoughts concerning himself. There is no escape then from the conclusion, that the original disciples, after the resurrection, understood and interpreted the character and mission of Jesus essentially as he himself understood and interpreted them. That is not to say that their ideas were fully developed, or that they saw all the bearings of their own utterances concerning the Christ. But they did not fail absolutely to get at the heart of their Master. If this be true, then any later interpretation of the character and mission of the Christ, which differs radically from this earliest interpretation, is a perversion and corruption of Jesus's teaching. Now Dr. McGiffert tells us that "only after some time had passed did Christian thinkers begin to fill in the conception of the Messiahship with this and that content" (p. 54), so that Jesus came to be thought of "as the incarnation of deity and as the perfect and ideal man" (p. 31). Who then was so bold as to shift thus completely the centre of gravity of Christianity? Dr. McGiffert assures us that to the early disciples "Christianity . . . was Judaism and nothing more. It was not even a substitute for Judaism, nor even an addition or supplement to Judaism ; it was not, indeed, in any way distinct from the national faith" (p. 58). This is an amazing statement, and, if it be true, then we are forced to one of two conclusions : Either Jesus's teaching and Gospel were in no way different or distinct from the current Judaism of his day, or his disciples went to school to him to no purpose. If we take the former alternative, then Paul and not Jesus was the founder of historic Christianity, which certainly is distinct from the Judaism of Christ's day. Professor McGiffert does not wholly shrink from this alternative. He says that "the first recorded departure from primitive principles took place in connection with the Caesarean centurion, Cornelius" (p. 101), but the primitive disciples did not on this account "become any the less truly Jews, nor did they consciously waive any of their ancestral prerogatives" (p. 108). They still believed then that "Christianity . . . was Judaism and nothing more." Paul, however, had been some time in the field, and his Gospel was something quite different. For "not to the teaching of Christ, but to the teaching of Paul, does the church owe its controlling emphasis upon the Savior's death ; and not to the former, but to the latter, is chiefly due its recognition of him as a Redeemer from sin." Either Christ was not aware of his own true character and mission, or Paul distorted his Gospel and transformed him, the Jewish Messiah, into a world-wide Redeemer from sin. But we are hardly prepared to take either horn of this dilemma. Suppose we test the alternative of which we have spoken, viz., that the disciples went to school to Christ to no purpose. There are certain insurmountable objections to this theory. It impugn Christ's wisdom in choosing these men ; it discounts his

capacity as a teacher ; it fails to account for the preservation of his deeds and words ; and it violates a well-known law of the human mind. The twelve had been with him from the beginning ; they had shared his daily life, and listened to his gracious words. When he was taken away, if they reflected at all, they must have found something in his Gospel besides Judaism. No doubt they fell far short in many respects in their apprehension of his teaching, but not in all respects. We are told that our "sources" compel us to write them down as "Jews in all particulars." This we deny. Our Gospels must be taken into account in forming our opinion of "primitive" Christianity. The so-called "sources" for "Jewish Christianity" are but the veriest fragments, and we are not justified in drawing our picture of the beginnings of Christianity from them *alone*. Moreover, Paul and the original apostles never differed radically concerning the character and personality of their Master. They worshipped the same Lord, and that Lord was Jesus of Nazareth,—to Paul as well as to Peter. Paul did not depart so absolutely from primitive Christianity as to change its very centre of gravity. Jesus is under no obligations to Paul for his divinity, nor even for his pre-existence.

It is not possible within the limits allotted us to proceed farther in the examination of Dr. McGiffert's book. Its good and strong qualities appear more and more abundantly, after he has passed beyond the origin of Christianity and primitive Jewish Christianity. Much can be said in praise of its treatment of many vexed questions, and in every discussion the author shows himself a keen critic who seeks only to get at the truth. No student of the Apostolic Age can afford to pass this book by, and we are only sorry that we cannot commend it in all particulars.

EDWIN KNOX MITCHELL.

Christian Institutions. By A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge. (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897. Pp. xxi, 577.)

THIS treatise aims to be "a summary of the church's history from the point of view of its institutions." It consists of three books, which treat respectively of the Organization of the Church, the Catholic Creeds and the Development of Doctrine, and Christian Worship. Book I. comprises nearly one-half of the whole treatise, and is a rediscussion of a well-worn theme, with some variations in the method of handling it, but with no real additions to our knowledge of the subject. After taking a "historical survey," Dr. Allen gives us an interesting chapter on Apostles, Prophets and Teachers, in which he expounds the New Testament use of these terms, and attempts to reproduce "the picture of the ministry in the apostolic age." He declares that the authoritative description of the ministry during this time has been given us by St. Paul in I. Cor. xii. 28, and that it is in substantial agreement with the accounts in the earlier chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Our author passes to the